

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**FEE TRANSMITTAL  
for FY 2004**

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$) 330

**Complete if Known**

Application Number 09/961,414

Filing Date September 25, 2001

First Named Inventor HIRAI ET AL.

Examiner Name V. Ford

Art Unit 1645

Attorney Docket No. 12218/1

**METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)**☐ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money ☐ Other ☐ None  
Order☒ Deposit Account:Deposit  
Account  
Number

11-0600

Deposit  
Account  
Name

KENYON &amp; KENYON

The Director is authorized to: (check all that apply)

☒ Charge fee(s) indicated below ☒ Credit any overpayments  
☒ Charge any additional fee(s) during the pendency of this application  
☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee  
to the above-identified deposit account.**FEE CALCULATION****1. BASIC FILING FEE**

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)		
1001	770	2001	385	Utility filing fee	
1002	340	2002	170	Design filing fee	
1003	530	2003	265	Plant filing fee	
1004	770	2004	385	Reissue filing fee	
1005	160	2005	80	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1)

(\$) 0

**2. EXTRA CLAIM FEES FOR UTILITY AND REISSUE**

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
	0	0	0
Independent Claims	0	0	0
Multiple Dependent			0

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	
1202	18	2202	9	Claims in excess of 20
1201	86	2201	43	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	290	2203	145	Multiple dependent claim, if not paid
1204	86	2204	43	** Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	18	2205	9	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2)

(\$) 0

\*\*or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

**FEE CALCULATION (continued)****3. ADDITIONAL FEES**

Large Entity		Small Entity		Fee Description	Fee Paid
Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)		
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.	
1053	130	1053	130	Non-English specification	
1812	2,520	1812	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination	
1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	420	2252	210	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	950	2253	475	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,480	2254	740	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	2,010	2255	1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	330	2401	165	Notice of Appeal	
1402	330	2402	165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	330
1403	290	2403	145	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable	
1453	1,330	2453	665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
1501	1,330	2501	665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
1502	480	2502	240	Design issue fee	
1503	640	2503	320	Plant issue fee	
1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1809	770	2809	385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
1810	770	2810	385	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	
1801	770	2801	385	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1802	900	1802	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify)

\*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3)

(\$) 330

**SUBMITTED BY**

Name (Print/Type)

Zeba Ali

Signature

Registration No.  
(Attorney/Agent)

51,392

Telephone

202 220 4200

Date

November 12, 2004

**WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.



12218/1  
Appeal Brief  
09/961414

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPELLANTS : HIRAI, Fumiyasu *et al.*  
SERIAL NO. : 09/961,414  
FILING DATE : September 25, 2001  
FOR : ENTEROTOXIN ADSORBENT, METHOD OF  
ADSORPTIVE REMOVAL, AND ADSORPTION  
APPARATUS  
EXAMINER : V. FORD  
GROUP ART UNIT : 1645

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### **APPEAL BRIEF**

Appellants respectfully submit this Appeal Brief in support of their appeal from the final rejection in this application.

### **Real Party in Interest**

The real party in interest is the Assignee of record, Kaneka Corporation.

### **Related Appeals and Interferences**

No other appeals or interferences are known to the Appellants, or to the Assignee or the Assignee's legal representatives involved in the prosecution of this application that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

11/15/2004 JBALINAN 00000131 110600 09961414  
01 FC:1402 340.00 DA

### **Status of Claims**

The application was originally filed with 5 claims. During prosecution, claims 6 through 10 were added and claims 1-3 and 5 were canceled. Therefore, claims 4 and 6-10 are pending. The Appellants appeal the rejection of all pending claims. The pending claims are reproduced in Appendix A of this brief.

### **Summary of Invention**

The present invention is directed to a method for adsorptive removal of enterotoxins in bodily fluid. Enterotoxins are toxins produced by *Staphylococcus aureus*, among other bacteria, which have various biological activities such as emetic, pyrogenic and mitogenic activities, inducing symptoms of food poisoning or being causative of toxic shock syndrome (TSS) (See page 1, lines 14-17). The method for the removal of such enterotoxins, as recited in claims 4 and 6-10, includes using an adsorbent comprising a compound with a log P value of not less than 3.00, as immobilized on a water-insoluble carrier. P represents a partition coefficient in an octanol-water system (See claim 1).

The present application describes screening for compounds for adsorption of enterotoxins by immobilizing compounds having various log P values on a water-insoluble carrier and evaluating their respective adsorptive affinity for enterotoxins. (See page 5, lines 32-35). Appellants found that compounds having a log P value of not less than 3.00 are effective in the adsorption of enterotoxins, while compounds with log P values of less than 3.00 do not appreciably adsorb enterotoxins. For example, as shown from a comparison of Example 1 and Example 2 of the present specification, the adsorbing property in Example 1 using n-hexadecylamine (log P=7.22) is better than that obtained in Example 2 using n-octylamine (log P=2.90). (See page 12, line 29 to page 13, line 17; and Table 1, page 14 at line 10).

### **Issues**

Are claims 4 and 6-10 rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Nagaki *et al.* Journal of Med. Microbiol., Vol. 38, pages 354-359 (1993) ("Nagaki") in view of EP 0993834 to Hirai *et al.* ("Hirai").

### **Grouping of the Claims**

The claims are addressed collectively.

### **Argument**

A. **There is no Motivation or Suggestion to Combine the Teachings of Nagaki and Hirai**

Hirai describes a method for adsorbing toxic shock syndrome toxin-1 (TSST-1). However, Hirai does not mention enterotoxins at all, as recited in claims 4 and 6-10.

Nagaki describes a method for adsorbing enterotoxin A but Nagaki does not disclose using adsorbents comprising a compound having a log P value of not less than 3.00, as recited in claims 4 and 6-10. Nagaki only describes that enterotoxins and TSST-1 "are structurally closely related." In the Office Action of March 19, 2004 (page 6), the Examiner stated that one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that TSST-1 and enterotoxins have similar adsorbent properties. However, the Examiner did not specifically point to any support for such a statement either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Indeed, Nagaki merely describes that enterotoxins and TSST-1 "are structurally closely related" and neither Hirai nor Nagaki mentions the relationship between the adsorbent property of enterotoxins and the adsorbent property of TSST-1. Accordingly, Appellants submit that there is no motivation to a person of skill in the art to replace the adsorbent in the adsorptive method for enterotoxin A of Nagaki with the adsorbent of TSST-1 of Hirai.

B. **There is No Reasonable Expectation of Success**

Appellants submit that there is absolutely no indication in Hirai or Nagaki or in the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to reasonably conclude that TSST-1 as well as enterotoxins can be removed with the same adsorbent with a reasonable expectation of success. Concerning the relationship between TSST-1 and enterotoxins, Nagaki merely describes that enterotoxins and TSST-1 "are structurally closely related" and Hirai makes absolutely no comparison of enterotoxins and TSST-1. In the chemical field, it is general knowledge that two compounds that are structurally

similar can often have quite different properties. In view of this general knowledge, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have concluded that enterotoxins and TSST-1 have similar adsorbent properties simply from the statement in Nagaki that enterotoxins and TSST-1 are structurally closely related (without in any way describing the relationship between the adsorbent property of enterotoxins and the adsorbent property of TSST-1). Appellants emphasize that structural similarity does not necessarily parallel with adsorbent similarity.

Throughout the Office Actions, the Examiner did not seem to take into account this general knowledge that structurally similar compounds do not necessarily have similar adsorbent properties, and did not point to any support in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art for otherwise concluding that TSST-1 and enterotoxins have similar adsorbent properties. Instead, the Examiner used the Appellants' disclosure to try to establish this point. Specifically, on page 4-5 of the Examiner's Advisory Action, the Examiner stated:

It should be noted that the adsorbent comprising compounds with log P values of not less than 3.00 as immobilized on a water-insoluble carrier used for the removal of TSST-1 as taught by Hirai et al are the same as the adsorbents used in the claimed method of removing enterotoxins (see page 7 of the instant specification). Therefore, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that TSST-1 (an exotoxin) and enterotoxins have similar adsorbent properties and TSST-1 as well as enterotoxins can be removed using an adsorbent comprising a compound with a log P value of not less than 3.00 as immobilized on a water-insoluble carrier with a reasonable expectation of success.

*(emphasis in original).*

It is well established that the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, and not in the applicant's disclosure. See In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Indeed, it was the Appellants who demonstrated for the first time in the present application that enterotoxin and TSST-1 show similar adsorbent properties on the claimed adsorbent. Nagaki, as well as Hirai, does not disclose this discovery and one of ordinary skill in the art could not have derived this discovery from the disclosures of Nagaki and Hirai or from the general knowledge at the time the claimed invention was made. Accordingly, based on a proper analysis, Appellants

submit that there is no basis for a reasonable expectation of success that the adsorbent for TSST-1 of Hirai can adsorb enterotoxin A in the method of Nagaki.

**Conclusion of Argument**


Appellants submit that the Examiner has not met her burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness against claims 4 and 6-10. Specifically, Appellants submit that there is no motivation for a person of skill in the art to replace the adsorbent in the adsorptive method for enterotoxin A of Nagaki with the adsorbent of TSST-1 of Hirai to produce the claimed invention. Further, there is no reasonable expectation of success that the adsorbent for TSST-1 of Hirai can adsorb enterotoxin A in the method of Nagaki. Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of the pending claims should be reversed.

**Fee Authorization**

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee for this appeal brief of \$330.00 as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(c) to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: Nov. 12 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Zeba Ali  
(Reg. No. 51,392)

1500 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 220-4200  
Fax: (202) 220-4201

APPENDIX A

4. A method for adsorptive removal of an enterotoxin in a body fluid which comprises contacting an enterotoxin-containing body fluid with an enterotoxin adsorbent to adsorb and remove the enterotoxin, wherein said enterotoxin is at least one selected from the group consisting of staphylococcal enterotoxins A, B, C1, C2, C3, D, E, G, H, and I, said adsorbent comprising a compound with a log P, in which P represents a partition coefficient in an octanol-water system, value of not less than 3.00 as immobilized on a water-insoluble carrier.
6. The method according to claim 4, wherein said water-insoluble carrier is a water-insoluble porous carrier.
7. The method according to claim 6, wherein said water-insoluble porous carrier has a molecular weight of exclusion limit of 50000 to 600000 for globular protein.
8. The method of claim 4, wherein said compound with a log P value of not less than 3.00 is at least one selected from the group consisting of unsaturated hydrocarbons, alcohols, amines, thiols, carboxylic acids and derivatives thereof, halides, aldehydes, hydrazides, isocyanates, oxirine ring-containing compounds, and halogenated silanes.
9. The method according to claim 4, wherein said compound with a log P value of not less than 3.00 is an amine.
10. The method according to claim 4, wherein said compound with a log P value of not less than 3.00 is hexadecylamine.